DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 872 SP 008 788

AUTHOR	Hawthorne, Richard D.; And Others
TITLE	A Report of a Formative Evaluation Study of the Kent State University Teacher Education Center Program.
INSTITUTION	Kent State Univ., Ohio. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	65p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperating Teachers; Educational Quality; *Formative Evaluation; Inservice Teacher Education; Preservice Education; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Teachers; *Teacher Centers

ABSTRACT

This report presents a description of one attempt to gain some insight about the actual workings and quality of a particular formulation of the teacher education center concept. The report is organized to provide a background and rationale of the Kent State University Teacher Education Center (where the model has been implemented), the design and instrumentation of the study, a description of the roles and activities within the centers, the degree of satisfaction with various key aspects of the program, and implications for the immediate future. The report is divided into the following sections: (a) background and rationale for the center, (b) the design for the formative evaluation of the center, (c) findings, (d) evaluation of the associate teacher (student teacher) program, (e) evaluation of the cooperating teacher program, (f) summary, (g) conclusions, and (h) appendixes composed of questionnaires used in the formative evaluation of the center. (JA)

Kent State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

College of Education

SP005 718

ED 100372

A Report of A
Formative Evaluation Study
of the Kent State University
Teacher Education Center Program

May 1974

Office of Professional Field Experiences

Richard D. Hawthorne
George Bard
James E. Douglass
Joan D. Kise
William W. Wilen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background and Rationale	3
The Design	11
Findings	14
Associate Teacher	26
Cooperating Teacher	29
Summary	35
Conclusions	39
Appendix	43

INTRODUCTION

This is indeed a time of ferment and change in teacher education. New models, grounded in part on empirical data and mixed generously with both old and new myths, are assaulting the profession with great effect. To what extent are the new paradigms influencing the quality and character of teacher education? To what extent are we whistling in the dark? To what extent are we able to show progress? Only to the degree that we study and evaluate our efforts--not to prove and affirm but also to reject and modify--will we sort the myth from reality and base programs on data rather than hope or distortion.

Teacher education centers (TEC) represent one of the more recent efforts to change at least one arena of teacher education. While a limited amount of research and evaluation has been undertaken in the study of the effects of TEC's, the questions of quality and impact of the various forms of TEC's are as yet unanswered.

This report presents a description of one attempt to gain some insight about the actual workings and quality of a particular formulation of the teacher education center concept. Cognizant of recent research, trends and premises about the field-based components of teacher education programs, we wanted to discover to what extent our own efforts were realizing impact, to what extent they were not new realities but new myths.

The report is organized to provide a background and rationale of the Kent State University TEC model, where it has been implemented, the

design and instrumentation of the study, a description of the roles and activities within the centers, the degree of satisfaction with various key aspects of the program, and implications for the immediate future.

Background and Rationale of the Kent State University Teacher Education Center Program

In the process of assessing the efficacy of efforts in the preparation of school professionals, attention is immediately drawn to the school-based components of university teacher education programs. For the person in the process of becoming a teacher or administrator, the most salient aspect of the formal training, the component that holds the greatest impact and personal meaning is student teaching. The strength of this impact takes on even greater significance when we recognize that the person in training is entering or already a part of a growing mosaic of diverse forms of schooling. We can no longer assume that one cooperating teacher with the assistance of a transient university supervisor will provide the environment needed to prepare a professional for the 1970's. If we are to be held accountable by our students and profession we must explore new forms of field training.

The emergence on a national scale of teacher education centers is one response to the need for strengthening the in-service and pre-school education of teachers.

The Purposes of a KSU Teacher Education Center

The purposes of the KSU Teacher Education Center program are premised on a diverse yet compatible set of factors; some derived from research findings, others compiled from an analysis of proposed and implemented innovations in professional training, and still others that have emerged from our own convictions about teaching and schooling. The overarching purposes include:

1. Bringing school and university people together in a parity relation to jointly plan, implement and evaluate the field-based components of professional training programs.
2. Providing an array of school-based programs and environments for the field aspects of professional training for a significant number of persons at both the pre- and in-service phases of development.
3. Contributing to the efforts of the cooperating schools in the areas of curriculum development, organizational change, instructional innovations, program evaluation, and other areas deemed appropriate through in-house in-service programs.
4. Undertaking the systematic study of field training to evaluate our efforts as well as to contribute to our knowledge about in-service and pre-service training programs.

Clearly these new directions are premised on the beliefs that (1) the quality of the field-based components of our professional training programs will be increased and (2) the instructional programs of pupils in the cooperating schools will be enhanced.

Features of the Teacher Education Concept

The basic features of the Teacher Education Center concept can be best illustrated by contrasting it with a conventional student teaching program.

Conventional Program	Center Program
One of five or six student teachers assigned to the same school or adjacent schools in a district.	Twenty to twenty-five trainees assigned to a single or two adjacent schools.

Conventional Program	Center Program
Student teacher assigned to one teacher for the quarter, usually replicating the same basic competencies.	Trainees assigned to teams or groups of teachers for the quarter, complementing and extending the instructional staff competencies.
Student teacher's program loosely defined by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.	Curriculum for the trainees systematically developed by the center staff including trainees and university members.
Cooperating teachers and administrators receive little systematic preparation by the university for assuming the role of a teacher of teachers.	Center staff receives systematic training to become teachers of teachers.
Student teacher program not integrated into the total instructional program of the school.	Professional development program integrated with the total school program.
Cooperating teacher supervises one student teacher per year.	Center staff works with trainees each quarter.
University supervisor visits 25 student teachers in as many as 20 different schools, each four to six times.	University supervisor is based in the center three to four days a week.
Student teaching seminar held on campus once a week during the early evening.	Professional seminar utilizes the staff and context of the center and is held at the center during the professional day.
In-service for schools not related to student teaching program.	In-service an integral part of the center operation.
No comprehensive evaluation of the student teaching program.	Systematic study and evaluation of each center and total program.

A school district may have more than one center; e.g., a center for the elementary school, a middle school center, a special education center, various secondary centers, etc. In some districts, the centers will reflect a consortium effort in which two or more universities are cooperatively involved, (e.g., in Hudson and Beachwood three universities are cooperatively related within the center).

The long range goal is to develop a network of centers that represent an array of distinct programs and settings. Currently, the network includes urban, suburban and small community settings with programs that include open classroom, IGE, departmental, and self-contained organizations. Curricula vary as well and range from conventional subject matter to interdisciplinary mini-courses.

The Program for Associate Teachers (Student Teachers)

While each center develops its own program over time, the following guidelines communicate the directions and climate we feel necessary to build a sound professional program:

1. Two or three associate teachers assigned to a team of three or four cooperating teachers at the same level or area of the curriculum, (e.g., 3-4 second grade teachers, a vertical team of a first, second and third grade teacher, the English Department, etc.).
2. The associate teacher develops a personal set of objectives for professional development to be added to those developed by the center staff.
3. The associate teachers are involved as quickly as deemed appropriate into full professional membership on the team.
4. Associate teachers are involved in the full array of tasks that all other members of the team do (e.g., professional meetings, parent conferences, grading, lunch room/playground duties, etc.).
5. Systematic observation and feedback of associate teachers by cooperating teachers, (e.g., weekly planned observation using

Flanders or other system -- planned conferences).

6. Regularly scheduled comprehensive evaluation sessions of each associate teacher by all cooperating teachers in the team (3-4 per quarter per associate teacher).
7. Associate teachers engaged in systematic self-analysis and self-evaluation.
8. Seminar conducted at the center by University Clinical Professor and center staff during the professional day.

In-Service Program

Initial in-service efforts have focused on providing cooperating teachers an array of skills and knowledge related to the training of teachers. Included in this arena have been action oriented workshops in the areas of microteaching, instructional analysis, conference strategies, needs assessment and the evaluation of teaching. These are open-ended skills in that they do not prescribe what "good" teaching is, rather they enhance the analysis and feedback of teaching to the trainee so that he is aided in the process of defining himself as teacher.

While other dimensions or more intensive treatment of these topics have been pursued throughout the year in particular centers, other in-service areas have emerged from the staffs of several centers.

The university contributes to the in-service efforts of a center by means of a consultant team approach. A consultant team includes the clinical professor based at the center, other clinical professors from other centers, administrative or instructional members of other centers, and/or university based professors. The center based clinical professor

is the primary resource with others serving as backup and on-call consultants. Projects of major undertaking that require the expertise of several persons, some outside the network of centers or the university or a major time commitment of the university staff require additional funding for support. This may come from the board of education or an external source such as Title III.

Organization of a Center

Each center is encouraged to develop its own organizational structure. Three elements seem to be useful regardless of the particular format used; a steering committee, a center coordinator and the university supervisor.

Steering Committee: This group is intended to make decisions regarding the specific programs and policies within the center that are related to the training of the staff -- both pre- and in-service members. This committee may also establish standing committees on pre-service program, in-service program, program evaluation, etc.

The make-up of the committee typically reflects a balance in membership and includes administrators, teachers, trainees, and possibly laymen--e.g., a school board member. The chairmanship is held by a school related person.

Center Coordinator: A person is typically designated as the coordinator of the center program. His functions include facilitating the assignment of trainees, facilitating the policies established by the steering committee, assuring integration of the training programs with the instructional program of the school, chairing the steering committee and coordinating the payment of teacher stipends.

Clinical Professor (University Supervisor): The role of the university supervisor has undergone a radical redefinition as we implemented the center concept. Changes have included a greater focus on the training of teachers of teachers, contributing to the curriculum development efforts of the school, conducting action research related to professional training, implementing with the staff a practicum program for student teaching, and contributing to in-service programs. These activities will be described more fully on page 14.

Intended Benefits of a Center

For the Trainees: The opportunity to work closely with several teachers, each with his own style and repertoire of skills.

The opportunity to gain insights about the realities of first and second year teachers in addition to the more experienced teachers.

The opportunity to work with an array of pupils in various programs.

Interaction with and support of fellow associate teachers,

Involvement in a training program designed to make the most of the expertise, talents and capacities of the personnel and environment of the center.

The opportunity to have more contact with the university faculty in a reality-based context.

For the Staff of the Center: In-service programs developed by and with the staff and conducted within the center.

The additional resources the trainees offer through the competencies and talents each brings to the center.

The exhilaration of having a group of mature but "bright eyed and

bushy-tailed" young adults in the center.

The desire to individualize an instructional program can become a reality when a number of competent adults are available.

For the Pupils: The research findings are most supportive of the value of teacher trainees in relation to student achievement and attitude.

The opportunity for a student to find an adult to relate to, to help him, to just plain listen to him is greatly enhanced when 8-10 more adults are available in the school.

Because two-thirds of the trainees have not been with the youngsters since September, they tend to bring a refreshing vitality to the school that is passed on to the students.

It was with this rationale and intention in mind that we approached and were contacted by interested school districts to explore implementations of the program. During the 1971 academic year, groundwork was laid and three K-6 level Teacher Education Centers were initiated. 1972 and 1973 saw the development of several new centers and included the following districts:

DISTRICT	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE	SENIOR HIGH
CANTON	X		X
AKRON	X		X
BEACHWOOD	X	X	X
MENTOR	X	X	X
SALEM	X		X
DOVER-NEW PHILADELPHIA	X		X
SOLON-ORANGE	X	X	X
PARMA			X
WARREN	X		X
NORTH OLMSTED	X		
LAKEWOOD	X		

With the installation of a new program in a number of districts calling for new policies and practices and yielding new problems, the need to evaluate our progress became critical. Did we in fact develop a new program or did we merely regroup and put new labels on old concepts and practices?

The Design for the Formative Evaluation of the Kent State University Teacher Education Center Program

Formative evaluation efforts attempt to assess a program at its early and developmental stages, prior to institutionalization. In order to make future decisions about the program we needed to discover to what extent we in fact had a teacher education center program; what aspects needed reinforcement, change or deletion; and what strengths and weaknesses various persons saw in the program.

It was decided that a center program was in existance if the following characteristics were present:

1. Fifteen to thirty associate teachers at the same level (elementary, secondary) are involved in a set of 1-4 schools in a district or two cooperating districts at least two of every three quarters.
2. The associate teachers are assigned to two or more cooperating teachers.
3. The associate teachers are able to have experiences in various instructional settings (e.g., tutoring, small group, total class, large group) and apply various instructional strategies (e.g., discussions, lecture, mediated instruction, simulations, etc.).

4. The program for the associate teacher is cooperatively developed in each center with objectives, rationale, strategies, and procedures for systematic feedback and evaluation specified.
5. The cooperating teachers receive, either formally or informally, in-service training in the supervision/teaching of teachers.
6. In-service in areas other than the supervision of associate teachers is planned, implemented and evaluated by the clinical professor and staff.
7. The pre-service and in-service professional development programs are integrated with the curricular, instructional and organizational components of the total school(s) program.
8. The same cooperating teachers work with associate teachers more than one quarter each year.
9. The majority of teachers in a center school are involved in the professional development of the associate teachers as cooperating teachers over a year's time.
10. A clinical professor is based and housed in the center 3-4 days a week, proportionate to the number of associate teachers assigned in the center schools.
11. The clinical professor works as much or more with cooperating teachers, instructional program development, and staff development as with associate teachers.
12. The seminar is planned, implemented and evaluated by representatives of all parties in the center. The seminar meets in the center.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13. Systematic study and evaluation of the center is conducted by the center personnel.

14. Associate teachers and cooperating teachers work as a team rather than associate teacher gradually taking over the total set of activities of a classroom.

15. A steering committee and coordinator exist and function.

In order to obtain data to affirm or reject the existence of the 15 factors, four questionnaires were developed and administered. The questionnaires are presented in Appendices A-D. A separate questionnaire was developed for each of the following populations:

Associate teachers	N = 189
Coordinating teachers	N = 392
Administrators	N = 55
Clinical Professors	N = 15

The instruments were administered during Spring Quarter, 1973.

The remainder of the report presents the findings and a discussion of the implications.

Findings

The Clinical Professor

During the 1972-73 academic year, Kent State operated 15 TEC's in Northeast Ohio. In total, approximately 1400 associate teachers, 350 cooperating teachers, 35 administrators, and 15 clinical professors were involved over a three-term (33 week) period.

As Kent State made the transition toward the center approach, the title and responsibilities of its student teaching supervisors began to change drastically. Traditionally the responsibilities included explaining the student teaching program to supervising teachers and administrators, observing student teachers, conferencing with student and supervising teachers, solving problems, participating in the formation of the student teachers' final evaluation, and conducting the University seminar that coincided with the student teaching experience. This procedure was generally accomplished in five visits to the cooperating schools over an eleven week period.

Under the TEC approach the major responsibilities of Kent State's clinical professors became more diverse and included the following:

1. Informally makes numerous contacts with associate teachers, cooperating teachers, and administrators about the progress of the associate teachers and makes formal observations of the teachers.
2. Serves on the TEC steering committee as the KSU representative.
3. Assists in implementing the policies established by the steering committee.

4. Assists in assigning associate teachers to TEC schools and cooperating teachers.
5. Assists in planning associate teaching experiences with associate and cooperating teachers.
6. Serves as a trouble-shooter when problems with the TEC program arise.
7. Assists in drafting the associate teachers' final recommendations.
8. Arranges and/or conducts in-service programs designed to provide cooperating teachers with supervisory skills.
9. Serves as a consultant in curricular and instructional matters on an informal and formal bases.
10. Serves as a resource person for the TEC and the University.
11. Coordinates and assists in conducting the TEC-based seminar.

Of the 15 clinical professors, seven are housed in Secondary Education and eight in Elementary Education. While all of the secondary level clinical professors hold doctorates, only three in elementary hold the terminal degree. The Elementary clinical professors have had more years of public school teaching, administrative experience, and associate teaching supervisory experience than their counterparts in Secondary Education. The typical Kent State clinical professor is male, holds a doctorate, has taught in the public schools for 11-1/2 years, served in public school administration for three years, and has supervised associate teachers at the college/university level for eight years (See Table I).

TABLE I

DESCRIPTORS OF KENT STATE UNIVERSITY CLINICAL PROFESSORS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Secondary	Range	Elementary	Range	Total
Number	7		8		15
Males	6		3		9
Females	1		5		6
Doctorates (highest degree)	7		3		10
Masters (highest degree)	0		5		5
Years public school teaching	8.6	2-20	14.0	8-27	11.5
Years public school administrative experience	1.0	0-5	4.5	0-10	2.9
Years university supervisor of associate teachers	7.6	1-17	8.1	4-11	7.9

The Cooperating Teacher

The professional most directly related to the Associate Teacher in the laboratory experience is the Cooperating Teacher. In the Center concept a varying number of cooperating teachers develop specific proficiencies to enable them singly or in teams to join associate teachers in a variety of learning activities within the instructional assignment. Teams may be composed of two or three cooperating teachers and a like number of associate teachers. One cooperating teacher may interact singly with one associate teacher or two cooperating teachers may team in shared responsibility with one associate teacher.

The pattern of cooperation is determined greatly by the organization of the school and the needs of the Associate Teachers. Responsibility for evaluation depends on the teaming pattern in the Center but always includes those cooperating teachers who have observed and conferred with the associate teachers.

At the time of the study 392 cooperating teachers responded to the questionnaire. Of these 57% were in elementary schools, 15% were in junior high or middle schools, and 27% were in high schools.

The professional preparation and experience of the cooperating teachers are shown below:

Professional Preparation and Experience of Cooperating Teachers (N = 392)

DEGREE	BACHELOR	MASTER	Ed.D	
	70%	27%	.2%	
TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1 - 2 yrs. 6%	3 - 5 yrs. 25%	6 - 10 yrs. 24%	11+ yrs. 37%

Associate Teachers

In the TEC design the term associate teacher replaces the term student teacher. It designates the university student in his senior year who is engaging in one academic quarter of practice teaching upon completion of most of the required professional sequence or methods courses. In the TEC's not only the term but the emphasis is different. The associate teacher works in association with two or more cooperating teachers. The associate typically works under the direction of one of the cooperating teachers. The program for the associate is planned so that he works in various ways with more than one cooperating teacher, in more than one setting and mode of instruction and gets feedback and assessment of teaching performance in different ways from each cooperating teacher. This type of teaming may tnen result in both associate and cooperating teacher being engaged in instruction at the same time in the same instructional space. Planning is also done cooperatively under the supervision of the cooperating teacher(s).

Responses from 189 associate teachers were received. These students were distributed throughout the range of teaching levels; 8% in early childhood, 40% in elementary education, 49% in secondary education, and 3% in special education. The group was composed of 37% males and 63% females.

Findings from Clinical Professor Questionnaire

The data from the questionnaires were analyzed in relation to five conditions pertaining to the functions of the clinical professor. Each condition is identified and the findings presented below.

First condition: A TEC is in existence if 15-30 associate teachers at the same level (elementary or secondary) are involved in a set of 1-4 schools in a district or two cooperating districts at least 2 of every 3 terms during the year.

The results of the evaluation revealed that 11 of the 15 clinical professors had either 15-30 associate teachers assigned at the same level for at least 2 terms during the year or had associate teachers in 1-4 schools. Eight of the clinical professors fully met the conditions of having 15-30 teachers at the same level involved in a set of 1-4 schools in no more than 2 districts for at least 2 of every 3 terms during the year. (See Table II)

Second condition: The clinical professor works as much or more with cooperating teachers, instructional program development, and staff development as with associate teachers.

The results of the evaluation showed that the clinical professors each spent an average of 13.8 hours extending over a typical two-week period conferencing with cooperating teachers, planning and conduction in-service programs, and providing consulting services in curriculum and instruction areas. At the same time, an average of 32.0 hours was spent observing and conferencing with associate teachers. The clinical professors spent 18.2 more hours over a two-week period engaging in those activities characteristic of the traditional role of a college supervisor than in the new prescribed role. (See Table III)

Third condition: The cooperating teachers receive, either formally or informally, in-service training in the skills of supervision.

Fourth condition: In-service in areas other than the supervision

TABLE II

ASSOCIATE TEACHERS PER TERM: TOTAL ASSOCIATE TEACHERS & SCHOOLS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		Term			Total	Total Schools
	Clinical Professor	Fall	Winter	Spring	Associate Teachers	
Elementary	1	26	29	12	67	5
	2	9	17	14	40	5
	3	21	16	11	48	2
	4	16	19	16	51	2
	5	21	28	12	61	4
	6	24	0	8	32	3
	7	20	24	16	60	4
	8	24	28	22	74	3
Secondary	1	18	17	19	54	5
	2	15	20	24	59	14
	3	20	23	19	62	3
	4	24	21	20	65	3
	5	4	12	14	30	1
	6	10	10	10	30	1
	7	22	24	24	70	3
Total	15	274	288	241	803	58

TABLE III

AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT BY CLINICAL PROFESSORS IN T.E.C. AND GENERAL UNIVERSITY ACTIVITIES*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Activity	Secondary	Elementary	Total
Traveling	16.2	13.9	15.1
Observing Associate Teachers	19.4	19.9	19.7
Conferencing with A.T.S.	12.3	12.31	12.3
Conferencing with Cooperating Teachers	11.1	10.3	10.7
Meeting with Coordinators	1.1	1.1	1.1
Meeting with Central Office	0.7	0.6	0.7
Seminars (Preparation and Session)	8.6	8.3	8.5
Working with Supervisory Intern	0	1.1	0.6
In-Service: Planning	0.6	1.4	1.0
Conducting	0.6	1.0	0.8
Steering Committee Meetings	0.8	1.1	1.0
Consulting in C & I with Departments Individuals Totals Schools	1.6	0.9	1.3
Professional Reading, Writing	8.7	5.7	7.2
Office Work	5.9	4.6	5.3
Department Committee Meetings	0.6	3.0	1.8
Collegial Committee Meetings	1.1	0.5	0.8
Teaching Class on Campus	0	1.6	0.8
Other	1.9	0.3	1.1
Total	93.1	91.1	92.5

*Assuming a two-week period

of associate teachers is planned, implemented and evaluated by the clinical professor and the school staff.

The results of the evaluation related to in-service showed that the clinical professors began providing cooperating teachers with formal and informal training in the skills of supervision. On the secondary level, two clinical professors made three formal introductory efforts to cooperating teachers in the areas of systematic observation/analysis and micro-teaching. One of these resulted in a full-scale training program in which a group of five teachers achieved an .80 coefficient of interobserver agreement with the clinical professor. On the elementary level, five clinical professors engaged in five formal or informal introductory efforts in the areas of systematic observation/analysis and conferencing techniques. Generally there was a reluctance on the part of cooperating teachers to engage in training programs beyond introductory presentations. At both levels, only 1.8 hours out of a two-week period was spent by the clinical professor planning and conducting in-service programs related to the development of supervisory skills.

Condition five: The seminar meets in the center and is planned, implemented, and evaluated by representatives of all parties in the center.

The results of the evaluation indicated that all clinical professors held their seminars during the professional day; 15 clinical professors met their seminars in the centers. Regarding the extent to which clinical professors, associate teachers, and center staff were involved in planning, implementing, and evaluating the seminar, the responses were varied but surprisingly similar for both secondary and elementary clinical professors. On a scale of 1 (greatly) to 5 (not at all) related to involvement of

participants in the seminar, it was found that clinical professors were greatly involved; associate teachers were considerably involved; cooperating teachers were somewhat involved; and the principal and other staff members were involved very little. Other staff members involved in the seminar included classroom teachers other than cooperating teachers, assistant principals, guidance personnel, media specialists, psychologists, and reading supervisors. (See Table IV)

Another critically important outcome of the formative evaluation effort was the determination of the overall degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction toward the role of the clinical professor as expressed by administrators, cooperating teachers, associate teachers, and clinical professors. Without this relatively subjective component, this stage of the evaluation could not be considered complete. On a 1 (extremely satisfied) to 5 (extremely dissatisfied) scale, 87.3% of the administrators and 74.3% of the cooperating teachers expressed extreme satisfaction or satisfaction with the role of the clinical professor and only 1.8% of the administrators and 15.4% of the cooperating teachers indicated dissatisfaction or extreme dissatisfaction. The associate teachers, on the other hand, responded to more specific questions regarding the general responsibilities of the clinical professor. Ninety-one and six-tenths per cent of the associate teachers were extremely satisfied or satisfied with their communication with the clinical professor and only 2.1% were dissatisfied. None were extremely dissatisfied. Furthermore, 88.4% of the associate teachers were extremely satisfied or satisfied with the help given to them by the clinical professor and only 1.1% were dissatisfied. None of the associate

TABLE IV

INVOLVEMENT OF T.E.C. PERSONNEL IN SEMINARS

SECONDARY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Greatly 1	Considerably 2	Some 3	Very Little 4	Not At All* 5
Clinical Professor	X				
Principal(s)				X	
Cooperating Teachers				X	
Center Coordiantor			X		
Associate Teachers		X			
Other: (Teachers, Administrators, & Guidance Personnel, Media Coordinator)				X	

*1 = Greatest

5 = Not At All

X = Mean Score

teachers were extremely dissatisfied with the help given to them.

The clinical professors were asked to respond to what they considered the most valuable aspects of the center program at their individual centers as well as the overall program. The satisfactions the clinical professors experienced generally centered around the reduction of placement problems; increased availability of the clinical professor in the center schools; and, closely related to increased availability, the development of more effective supervision patterns.

Placement problems were reduced by eliminating marginal districts and schools and by providing opportunities for the associate teachers to choose the center and schools within the center in which they want to carry out their experience. Although the majority of the centers are located in suburban settings, several centers have urban and rural atmospheres providing optional environments for the associate teachers. The clinical professors also indicated they generally had more say in the selection of cooperating teachers which aided in reducing internally-oriented placement problems.

Increase in availability of clinical professors was brought about by the reduction of travel time and the number of schools required. The change in role from a traveling supervisor to one who was housed in a school system facilitated the formation of better and more continuous relationships with administrators and cooperating teachers. Because of the increased contacts with center schools, clinical professors became accepted as "staff" members rather than infrequent visitors.

More effective supervision patterns emerged from the increase in formal and informal contacts with center personnel regarding the associate teachers' progress. In the past, schools have generally been

reluctant to place an associate teacher with a cooperating teacher more than once per year. As a result of the center schools accepting more associate teachers each term and the placement of associate teachers on instructional teams, many of the clinical professors worked with the same cooperating teachers two or three times during the course of the school year. The cooperating teachers came to know the clinical professor's expectations for supervision through frequent contact and this seemed to provide a link of stability and continuity not previously present. There was also a strong feeling that the cooperating teachers became more proficient at teaching after working with associate teachers and that the associate teachers made a major contribution to the school's general instructional programs. Another valuable aspect of the center program, as perceived by the clinical professors, was the availability and partial involvement of school personnel in the center-based seminar.

Associate Teacher Program

Among the intended benefits for the associate teacher in the TEC program were (1) assignment in teams, (2) involvement in setting objectives for his own professional development, (3) speedy incorporation into the instructional team, (4) greater breadth of activity, (5) systematic observation and feedback from cooperating teacher, (6) regularly scheduled evaluation sessions, (7) opportunities for self-analysis, and (8) on-site seminars.

Three evaluative conditions pertained directly to these benefits: (1) "The program for associate teachers is cooperatively developed in each center with objectives, rationale, strategies, and procedures for systematic feedback and evaluation specified."

Several centers (10) have written objectives, rationale and guidelines. Others have an established procedure but had not put them in writing.

Regarding planned observation, sixty-two per cent of the associate teachers report five or more hours a week of observation by the cooperating teacher and 29% report five or more observations per quarter by the clinical professor.

Planned conferences with cooperating teacher five or more times per quarter were reported by 46% of the associate teachers, while planned conferences with clinical professors occured five or more times a quarter for 25% of the associate teachers.

Feedback of a formal nature was received by 52% of the associates five or more times in the quarter. Informal communication with the clinical professor was experienced five or more times a quarter by 46%. (See Table V)

A second condition pertained to the associate teachers' range of experience. (2) "The associate teachers are able to have experiences in various instructional settings and apply various instructional strategies."

At the conclusion of the laboratory experience, the majority of associate teachers both elementary and secondary felt competent to very competent in a wide variety of instructional skills. (See Table V)

A third condition of the laboratory experience pertained to involvement on the instructional team. (3) "Associate and cooperating teachers work as a team rather than associates gradually moving from observation to taking over the responsibility of the classroom."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE V

ASSOCIATE TEACHERS REPORTED COMPETENCIES FOLLOWING STUDENT TEACHING

	1	2	3	4	5*
Tutor a Student In My Field of Grade					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	67	31	0	1	1
Secondary: % (N=92)	63	22	3	3	9
Conduct Small Group Instruction					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	66	33	0	1	0
Secondary: % (N=92)	65	24	5	3	3
Lecture to a Class Size Group					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	43	49	6	1	1
Secondary: % (N=92)	57	32	6	3	2
Write Behavioral Objectives					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	32	56	9	2	1
Secondary; % (N=92)	21	49	23	2	5
Plan a Lesson Alone					
Early Childhood & Elementary: 5 (N=88)	75	24	0	1	0
Secondary: % (N=92)	64	30	3	1	2
Plan a Unit Alone					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	48	43	5	2	2
Secondary: % (N=92)	46	30	11	8	5
Select Audio-Visual Materials					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	50	46	2	2	0
Secondary: % (N=92)	41	47	5	3	4
Develop My Own Instructional Methods					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	41	52	5	1	1
Secondary: % (N=92)	41	45	8	3	2
Develop Ways of Assessing Student Learning					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	26	54	17	3	0
Secondary: % (N=92)	18	58	16	4	4
Analyze and Evaluate My Own Teaching Behaviors					
Early Childhood & Elementary: % (N=88)	28	55	14	0	3
Secondary: % (N=92)	18	50	26	1	5

*1= Very Competent
2= Competent
3= Not Sure
4= Not Very Competent
5 = No Opportunity to Find Out

Although more than 50% of both elementary and secondary associate teachers felt competent to be team members there is a great gap in the hours of experience gained in cooperative teaching. Sixty-one per cent of early childhood and elementary associates report five or more hours a week of working with small groups in a team setting while only 19% of secondary associate teachers report such a frequency of the experience. "Teaching Cooperatively" was experiences by 43% of early childhood and elementary associate teachers (five or more times a week) and by 27% of the secondary associate teachers.

The study sought out degree of satisfaction with the program from all participants. Eighty per cent of all associate teachers expressed satisfaction with all phases of the program. Very few were negative or neutral. Since satisfaction was divided into "extremely" and "somewhat," it is beneficial to note that in 9 of the 11 items, more than 50% chose "extremely satisfied." (See Table VI)

Cooperating Teacher Program

Information in regard to supervisory practices and perceived needs of the cooperating teachers is provided by their responses to the questionnaire devised for that group.

The cooperating teachers use a variety of practices in observation and in feedback. Sixty per cent were involved in observation of associate teachers daily. Only 9% observed associate teachers less than five times a quarter.

Conferences with associate teachers were also daily occurrences; 31% conferred formally daily; 84% conferenced daily informally.

TABLE VI

ASSOCIATE TEACHER SATISFACTION WITH VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER PROGRAM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5*
Range of Experience % (N=89)	48	32	8	8	1
Teaching Load	54	29	10	5	1
Attitude of School Staff Toward Associate Teacher	54	21	14	6	4
Communication with Cooperating Teacher(s)	70	16	5	6	2
Help Given by Cooperating Teacher(s)	66	20	7	4	2
Communication with Clinical Professor	68	23	5	2	0
Help Given by Clinical Professor	66	23	9	1	0
Relationship with Other Associate Teachers	70	21	5	1	1
Relationship with Pupils	74	23	1	2	0
Seminar	56	24	12	4	2
Total Experience	48	35	6	6	3

*1 = Extremely Satisfied

2 = Somewhat Satisfied

3 = Neutral

4 = Somewhat Dissatisfied

5 = Very Dissatisfied

Feedback was provided associate teachers by written notes and comments by 36% of the cooperating teachers. Other feedback mechanisms used: Flanders Interaction Analysis, 8%; video-tape, 10%; audio-tape, 8%; checklists, 36%. Written notes and comments and conferences were indicated as most frequent avenues of feedback.

When asked which supervisory skills they judged important, the majority (56-8%) judged all skills listed as important with the exception of Flanders Interaction Analysis. Only 35% judged it an important skill for supervision. The cooperating teachers perceived themselves as being skilled, at least to some degree in:

Writing behavioral objectives

Analysis of teachers' classroom instructional behavior

Human relation skills

Analysis of their own supervisory behavior

Evaluating teachers.

Only 27% perceived themselves as skilled in the use of Flanders and like systems; 49% perceived skill in the use of audio-visual tape; 43% professed skill in micro-teaching.

On the whole, cooperating teachers expressed satisfaction with the TEC program. There was dissatisfaction by 20-25% of the cooperating teachers with:

The assignment of associate teachers to two or more cooperating teachers

Information about the associate teachers prior to arrival

In-service programs for cooperating teachers

Preparation of cooperating teachers to supervise associate teachers

Ten-week period for student teaching

Amount of stipend paid.

The cooperating teacher questionnaire also offers further information in regard to the basic criteria of the evaluation: (1) the associate teachers are assigned to two or more cooperating teachers, (2) the program for associate teachers is cooperatively developed in each center with objectives, rationale, strategies, and systematic feedback and evaluation specified, the cooperating teacher receives either formally or informally, in-service training the the supervision/ teaching of teachers.

Information as to the existence of each of these conditions is indicated by choice of alternatives other than "no experience or awareness of item." All but 14% had some experience of associate teachers assigned to two or more cooperating teachers. Some information in regard to cooperative planning is indicated in that 55% had no involvement in planning seminars. Two items pertained to preparation and in-service of cooperating teachers. Thirty-eight per cent expressed satisfaction with in-service for cooperating teachers, 33% had not experienced in-service, 52% were satisfied with their general preparation to supervise, only 16% had no experience of preparation.

Administrators

The group of administrators responding to the TEC questionnaire included 38 principals, 12 members of central office staff and 5 TEC coordinators.

Among the conditions necessary to establish the fact that Teacher Education Centers were in fact functioning which were evaluated through the administrators questionnaire was, "Pre-service and in-service professional development programs are integrated with the curricular, instructional and organizational components of the total school program." In regard to organizational change or improvement resulting from involvement in TEC, great and moderate change was recognized in individualization of instruction by 82%; in team planning by 83%; in differentiated staffing by 54%; independent study by 54%; in-service staff development by 53%.

There was further agreement by 30-50% that change was also evidenced in mini courses, open classrooms, evaluation and grading and evaluation of the total school program. The least observed organizational change, curriculum revision was noted by 25% of the administrators.

Change from a slightly different base was also noted. Administrators were asked the degree of impact effected by the associate teachers. More than 70% of those responding reported impact through increased amount of individual help received by students, increased amount of small group instruction, stimulated cooperation and articulation among faculty, stimulated faculty to examine their own teaching behavior, methodology, or course content.

The impact of associate teachers on staff development compared with that of customary in-service, 29% found it to be greater and 40% found it to be equal.

Satisfaction of administrators with the TEC was expressed positively in every area by 50-80% of those sampled. Areas in which some expressed dissatisfaction (20-40%) were information about each associate teacher prior to arrival, in-service program for cooperating teachers, ten-week

period for student teaching, and the amount of stipend paid for cooperating teachers.

Another condition was checked indirectly through the administrator's questionnaire: "The steering committee and coordinators exist and function." Administrators were asked to experess satisfaction with the structure and operation of the steering committee. Since the alternatives included "no experience or awareness of the item," it can be concluded that 74% of the centers had functioning steering committees.

A summary evaluation of TEC was indicated by the administrators in choosing among the final alternatives: Keep the Center as it is, Close the Center, Keep the Center with the following changes. No administrator suggested closing the Center, 45% would keep it as it is and 53% would keep the Center with suggested changes.

Summary, Conclusion and Implications

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The purpose of this study was to assess, at a formative stage, the extent to which the proposed TEC program was becoming a reality. Several factors were deemed to be necessary conditions if, in fact, TEC's were in operation. The items on the questionnaires were developed to provide data in relation to the conditions as well as to obtain data about the degree of satisfaction the various respondents had with the center concept and program. Four populations were surveyed by means of questionnaires; administrators, cooperating teachers, associate teachers and clinical professors.

The findings show a range of practices, experiences, and extent of satisfaction across the several centers and populations. Presented below is each of the desired conditions of a TEC followed by a summarization of findings.

1. Fifteen to thirty associate teachers at the same level (elementary, secondary) are involved in a set of 1-4 schools in a district or two cooperating districts at least 2 of every 3 quarters.

Eight of the 15 centers met this condition as of Spring, 1973.

2. The associate teachers are assigned to two or more cooperating teachers.

While we were unable to determine exactly how many associate teachers were assigned to two or more cooperating teachers, 86% of the cooperating teachers reported they had experienced working in this arrangement.

3. The associate teachers are able to have experiences in various instructional settings (e.g., tutoring, small group, total class, large group) and apply various instructional strategies (e.g., discussions, lecture, mediated instruction, simulations, etc.).

Responses to items 4-21 on the associate teachers' questionnaire show that the vast majority of students had a range of experiences including tutoring, total class management, team teaching, etc.

4. The program for the associate teacher is cooperatively developed in each center with objectives, rationale, strategies, and procedures for systematic feedback and evaluation specified.

There are insufficient data from the questionnaires to determine the extent to which a specific program for associate teachers has been developed. However, there are eight centers that have developed written documents that present the rationale, objectives and general information and guidelines for the associate teacher program.

Procedures for systematic feedback and evaluation are not evident in writing. Reported practices by cooperating teachers, associate teachers and clinical professors indicate that planned observations and conferences are frequent. (62% of the associate teachers reported 5 or more hours a week of observations by the cooperating teacher).

5. The cooperating teacher receives, either formally or informally, in-service training in the supervision/teaching of teachers.

The data show that a great deal of informal in-service training related to supervision was taking place as the cooperating teacher and clinical professor worked together in the observation, conferencing and evaluation of the various associate teachers. Formal in-service efforts were reported as being initiated but not wide spread. Cooperating teachers reported a strong desire for in-service assistance in the supervision of associate teachers.

6. In-service in areas other than the supervision of associate teachers is planned, implemented and evaluated by the clinical professor and staff.

No data were reported to support that in-service was taking place in areas other than supervision as of Spring, 1973.

7. The pre-service and in-service professional development programs are integrated with the curricular, instructional and organizational components of the total school(s) program.

There are no data at this time to determine specifically the extent to which this condition is being met. The administrators' reports of the positive impact of the center program on curriculum, staff organization, and classroom instruction suggest that this is emerging.

8. The same cooperating teachers work with associate teachers more than one quarter each year.

The data show that only 43% of the cooperating teachers, during 1972-73 have had primary responsibility for 2 or more associate teachers.

9. The majority of teachers in a center school are involved in the professional development of the associate teachers as cooperating teachers over a year's time.

This condition varies extensively from center to center with some reporting 100% of staff involvement. Based on clinical professors' reports this is the case in most centers.

10. A clinical professor is based and housed in the center 3-4 days a week, proportionate to the number of associate teachers assigned in the center schools.

In 12 of the 15 centers this is met. While not all have established an office for the clinical professor, each has an area to meet and work with individuals.

11. The clinical professor works as much or more with cooperating teachers, instructional program development, and staff development as with associate teachers.

This was found not to be the case as the typical clinical professor worked with associate teachers nearly twice as much as with cooperating teachers and administrators.

12. The seminar is planned, implemented and evaluated by representatives of all parties in the center. The seminar meets in the center.

The seminar is planned primarily by the clinical professor with involvement of teachers and administrators in conducting the seminars. Associate teachers are actively involved in the evaluation of the seminars. In all but 4 centers, the seminar is conducted in one of the center schools.

13. Systematic study and evaluation of the center is conducted by the center personnel.

This has not yet been undertaken by the individual centers.

14. Associate teachers and cooperating teachers work as a team rather than associate teacher gradually taking over the total set of activities of a classroom.

Sixty-three per cent of the associate teachers reported cooperative teaching 2 or more hours a week. Twenty-five per cent reported no cooperative teaching.

15. A steering committee and coordinator exist and function.

Steering committees exist in 6 of the 15 centers. Coordinators exist and function in 5 of the centers.

Other findings not directly related to the 15 conditions provide insight about the extent of input and satisfaction with the TEC program.

70% of the associate teachers expressed satisfaction with the range of experiences they had.

75% of the associate teachers reported satisfaction with the attitude of the school staff toward them.

90% of the associate teachers reported satisfaction about communication with the help from the clinical professors.

86% of the associate teachers reported satisfaction about communication with the help from their cooperating teachers.

74% of the cooperating teachers and 85% of the administrators expressed satisfaction about communication with the clinical professor.

87% of the cooperating teachers reported satisfaction with the contribution by the associate teachers to the instruction of pupils.

Conclusions

The findings present an array of status points across the 15 conditions; some have not been started, others have a progress status, and still others are quite clearly being met.

The extent of supervision being received by associate teachers and their satisfaction with the cooperating teacher and clinical professors are definite plusses. The broad range of experiences and being able to work in a setting with several other associate teachers is also of significance.

One of the findings we found of great value was the report by both teachers and administrators that the TEC and associate teachers had contributed greatly to the instruction of pupils and in-service growth of teachers.

Areas in need of attention are organizational; steering committees were not yet formed or operational, communication from the Office of Professional Field Experiences about the associate teacher, more in-service for cooperating teachers and clinical professors, and more extensive time for student teaching were most frequently noted.

Implications and Recommendations

Analysis of the evaluation data yielded possible recommendations in three areas: (1) recommendations for further training for the associate teachers, cooperating teachers and administrators, (2) recommendations for training and clarification of the clinical professorship and, (3) recommendations for changes in the questionnaire for future evaluations.

Associate and Cooperating Teachers

1. Training or experience should be provided for the associate teachers in lecturing to large groups of 50+ (Question #24) in dealing with parent-teacher conferences (Question #38) and in developing achievement tests (Question #35) based on results of the associate teacher questionnaire.
2. Training and experience in the use of Flanders (Question #25), audio/visual feedback (Question #27), and micro-teaching (Question #29) should be provided through in-service programs for the cooperating teacher based on results of the cooperating teachers questionnaire.
3. Specific needs assessment should be done with the cooperating teachers to determine what types of in-service they would find useful. In-service should then be provided in those areas (Question #63 cooperating teachers and #10 administrators).

Clinical Professors

The clinical professors have indicated a need for:

1. Further clarification of the role of clinical professor as it applies to the TEC model.

2. Improved communication between centers and clinical professors in order to share experiences.
3. Additional in-service training for clinical professors.
4. Resolution of the question: Should the clinical professor be a generalist capable of providing training in many supervisory skill areas or should he or she be expert in only one or two areas?

Changes in the Questionnaire

The associate teachers questionnaire should further clarification on the following questions:

1. Question #50 indicated that 33% of the associate teachers felt neutral to very dissatisfied with their relationship with the principal. There is a need for further exploration of reasons for this.
2. Question #33 indicated that 26% of the associate teachers were dissatisfied to extremely dissatisfied with their relationship with the Office of Professional Field Experiences. Reasons for this dissatisfaction should be further explored.
3. Question #56 indicated 18% of the associate teachers felt neutral to dissatisfied with the seminars. Reasons for this should be explored.

The cooperating teachers questionnaire should include further clarification on the following questions:

1. Question #58 indicated that 22% of the cooperating teachers were dissatisfied/extremely dissatisfied with the assignment of the associate teacher to two or more cooperating teachers. Reasons for this dissatisfaction should be explored.

2. Question #59 indicated 28% of the cooperating teachers were dissatisfied/extremely dissatisfied in regard to the 10-week period for student teaching. Thirty-eight per cent of the administrators also responded in a similar manner (Question #11). Possible reasons for this dissatisfaction should be investigated.

The future of the TEC will call for continued adjustment if it is to be operational. While definite efforts have been made and changes from the conventional student teaching program are real, a number of factors must receive attention if the program is to meet its full promise.

APPENDIX

ADMINISTRATORS QUESTIONNAIRE

System OVERALL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

N = 58

1. Please check the most appropriate description of your position: Central Office (0) Principal (1) Coordinator (2)

0	1	2
21	71	9

Please indicate the degree of your s tisfaction with each of the following aspects of the Teacher Education Center in your district/school by circling the appropriate number.

(1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = no experience or awareness of item, 4 = dissatisfied, 5 = extremely dissatisfied)

	1	2	3	4	5
2. The structure of the Steering Committee	9	61	26	3	
3. The operation of the Steering Committee	7	53	28	10	
4. Relationship with the Office of Professional Field Experiences	34	45	7	7	
5. Assignment of associate teacher to two or more cooperating teachers	26	53	7	10	
6. Information about each associate teacher prior to arrival	16	57	3	21	2
7. In-service program for cooperating teachers	5	47	24	17	2
8. The role of the clinical professor	40	47	9	2	
9. Communication with the clinical professor	45	40	9		2

Frequency expressed in %

ADMINISTRATORS QUESTIONNAIRE

10. Preparation of cooperating teachers to supervise associate teachers

11. Ten-week period for student teaching

12. Orientation of associate teachers at the center

13. Subject matter preparation of associate teachers

14. Professional preparation of the associate teachers

15. Curriculum changes influenced by having a TEC in your school/district

16. Your involvement in planning and involvement in the seminar for associate teachers

17. Amount of stipend paid for supervision by cooperating teachers

18. Associate teachers and TEC contributions to the pupils' instructional program

19. Other -- (please specify any other factors you feel we need to know about

1	2	3	4	5
10	53	17	17	
5	57		22	16
10	72	12	3	
7	67	12	10	
7	66	14	10	
10	40	38	10	
10	48	29	9	2
7	50	12	28	
29	52	12	2	2
7				

Frequency Expressed in %

ADMINISTRATORS QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In this section would you please indicate by circling the appropriate number the extent to which you feel that the TEC program has contributed toward helping you or your staff implement changes in the following areas:

(1 = greatly, 2 = moderately, 3 = not at all, 4 = not in area of desired change at this time, 5 = no way to know at this time)

	1	2	3	4	5
20. Individualization of instruction	31	52	7	2	5
21. Team/coopertive planning	26	57	5	3	5
22. Differentiated staffing	9	45	26	9	5
23. Mini-courses	14	21	33	12	14
24. Independent study	16	38	24	5	12
25. Open classroom	9	29	34	13	7
26. Curriculum revision	5	19	38	12	17
27. Evaluation & grading of pupils	5	41	28	7	16
28. In-service staff development	12	38	24	3	12
29. Evaluation of total school program(s)	7	38	26	5	19
30. Community attitude toward the school(s)	7	33	19	5	29

ADMINISTRATORS QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please estimate the extent to which having a group of associate teachers has had impact in the following areas:

(1 = great, 2 = moderate, 3 = not at all, 4 = not a desired change at this time, 5 = no way to know at this time)

1	2	3	4	5
52	34	7	2	3
45	45	7		3
33	48	10	2	7
26	55	5	3	9
12	50	16	5	17
29	62	1	1	5

32. Increased the amount of individual help received by STUDENTS

33. Increased the amount of small group instruction

34. Stimulated cooperation and articulation among faculty

35. Stimulated the faculty to examine their own teaching behavior, methodology, or course content

36. Stimulated the faculty to change their behavior, methodology or course content

37. To what extent do you think working with associate teachers stimulates cooperating teachers to re-examine the art and science of teaching?

1	2	3	4	5
28	38	17	2	16

38. How would you compare this with the stimulation provided by your organized in-service program?

(1 = greater than, 2 = about the same, 3 = less than, 5 = no way to know)

39. Please check the response that best represents your overall feelings about the TEC

0	1	2
45		53

Frequency Expressed in %

(0) (a) Keep the Center as it is

(1) (b) Close this Center

(2) (c) Keep the Center with the following changes:

ASSOCIATE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

System OVERALL

N = 189

1. Please check your major: Early Childhood (0)
   Elementary (1) Secondary (2) Special Ed. (3)

2. Male (1) Female (2)

3. Approximately how many miles do you travel one way to get to this center each day?_____
   (0 = 1-5, 1 = 6-10, 2 = 11-15, 3 = 16-20, 4 = 21-25, 5 = 25+

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	38	49	3				
37	61						
24	16	13	14	4	25		

Please check the number that best approximates your answer (0-7)

During a typical week, approximately how many hours did you:

4. Tutor individual students
5. Work with a small group (3-12) while other teacher(s) worked with other groups
6. Be responsible for instruction of the whole class size group
7. Plan with your teacher(s)
8. Observe your supervising cooperating teacher or other teachers
9. Teach cooperatively with another teacher
10. Plan lessons or units on your own
11. Develop instructional materials
12. Receive observation by your cooperating teacher(s)

22	14	20	13	10	8	5	7
27	8	8	5	5	13	7	7
3	2	2	4	2	4	6	77
6	19	23	12	5	14	5	15
11	16	18	10	6	11	6	16
25	12	13	7	7	13	4	18
3	2	7	3	4	17	7	57
3	7	10	12	4	15	14	33
3	7	10	12	4	15	14	33

ASSOCIATE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Approximately how many times during the quarter: (0-7)

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Were you observed by your Clinical Professor (College Supervisor)	11	10	20	20	11	12	4	13
14. Were you observed by your principal or other administrator	57	17	11	8	3	2	2	
15. Did you visit other schools	46	16	15	11	4	4	2	3
16. Did you have a planned conference with your cooperating teacher(s)	10	10	12	10	10	8	6	32
17. Have a planned conference with your Clinical Professor/College Supervisor	22	17	16	15	5	7	5	13
18. Have informal communication with your Clinical Professor/College Supervisor	6	10	19	12	7	7	13	26
19. Have yourself video-taped or audio-taped	47	21	24	5	1	2		
20. Analyze your classroom behavior using some form of systematic observation	40	20	23	8	1	2	1	1
21. Did you receive an oral or written formal evaluation of your efforts	6	12	16	6	6	9	10	33

Frequency Expressed in %

ASSOCIATE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please indicate by circling the appropriate number, the extent to which you now feel competent to do the following:

(1 = very competent, 2 = competent, 3 = not sure,
4 = no opportunity to find out, 5 = not very competent)

	1	2	3	4	5
22. Tutor a student in my field or grade	65	26	1	5	2
23. Conduct small group instruction	64	29	2	2	3
24. Lecture to a large group (50+)	24	37	21	16	3
25. Lecture to class size group	49	41	6	2	2
26. Ask questions at various levels of difficulty (i.e., levels of Bloom's Taxonomy)	22	50	21	4	3
27. Write behavioral objectives	52	96	30	7	4
28. Plan a lesson alone	69	26	2	1	2
29. Plan a unit alone	47	36	8	4	5
30. Plan a total program alone	30	33	21	11	6
31. Select audio-visual materials	46	46	4	2	3

Frequency Expressed in %

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5
32. Develop my own instructional materials	41	48	6	2	3
33. Develop ways of assessing student teaching	22	54	17	2	4
34. Diagnose a student's learning style	14	47	27	9	3
35. Develop an achievement test	10	34	29	23	4
36. Be a team member	30	44	13	10	2
37. Coordinate the work of an aide or volunteer in the classroom	23	38	17	19	2
38. Discuss a student's status with a parent(s)	17	38	13	29	1
39. Develop my own grading system	34	42	10	12	2
40. Develop and maintain a positive classroom climate	37	54	6	.5	2
41. Supervise playground, lunchroom and other non-academic activities	41	34	9	11	3
42. Analyze and evaluate my own teaching behaviors	23	52	20	5	
43. Analyze reading materials for readability level, interest, etc.	19	45	23	10	2
44. Other:	10	8	4	2	2

Frequency Expressed in %

lease indicate your degree of satisfaction with the following aspects of the Center program.

(1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = somewhat satisfied, 3 = neutral, 4 = somewhat dissatisfied, 5 = very dissatisfied)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	1	2	3	4	5
45. Range of experiences as an associate teacher	48	32	8	8	.5
46. My teaching load	54	29	10	5	1
47. The attitude of the school staff toward associate teachers	54	21	14	6	4
48. Communication with cooperating teacher(s)	70	16	5	6	2
49. Help given by cooperating teachers	66	20	7	4	2
50 Relationship with principal	41	24	25	5	3
51. Communication with Clinical Professor	68	23	5	2	
52. Help given by Clinical Professor	66	23	9	1	
53. Relationship with Office of Professional Field Experiences	15	17	38	10	16
54. Relationship with other associate teachers	70	21	5	1	.5
55. Relationship with pupils	74	23	.5	2	
56. Seminar	56	24	12	4	2
57. My total experience thus far at the Center	48	35	6	6	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASSOCIATE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

	0	1
58. If you were to student teach again, would you choose to do it in a center (Yes 0 No 1)	72	19
I feel ready to teach in an (✓ = 0 Not checked = 1)		
59. Urban	56	43
60. Suburban	85	11
61. Rural	76	24
62. Small Town	82	18

57

Frequency Expressed in %

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CLASSROOM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

System OVERALL

N = 392

Variable:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Level at which you teach (0 = K-6, 1 = 7-9, 2 = 10-12)	51	15	29							
2. Subject area in which you teach (0 = All, 1 = English, 2 = Math, 3 = Social Studies, 4 = Science, 5 = Music, 6 = HPE, 7 = Industrial Arts)	54	12	6	14	4	1	.3	3	1	7
Number of Associate teachers you have supervised during the 1972-73 academic year										
3. Primary responsibility for (0-9)	15	42	25	10	2	.3	.5	.3	.3	6
4. Assisted in supervising (0-9)	41	24	12	5	1	.8	2	1	1	12
5. Do you have any formal training (e.g., course work, workshops, etc.) in the supervision of associate teachers? Yes (0) No (1)	13	86								
6. If none, would you want any? Yes (0) No (1)	55	23								
7. Highest degree presently held B.A. (0) M.A. (1) Ph.D. (2)	70	27	.3							
8. Number of years of teaching experience (0 = 1-2, 1 = 3-5, 2 = 6-10, 3 = 11+)	6	25	24	37	3					
9. Are you currently enrolled in a graduate school program? Yes (0)	24	75								

Frequency Expressed in %

CLASSROOM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. A. Please circle the appropriate number:

	0 (1-2)	1 (3-4)	2 (5-6)	3 (7-10)	4 (daily)
10. Approximately how often do you conduct a scheduled observation of an associate teacher each quarter	4	5	6	15	66
11. Approximately how often do you have a planned conference with an associate teacher each quarter	7	16	14	29	31
12. Approximately how often do you have an informal conference with an associate teacher each quarter	2	2	3	7	84
13. Approximately how often do you have a conference with a Clinical Professor each quarter	24	40	19	11	.5

56

B. Please check the way(s) you provide feedback for the associate teacher. Please circle the one you tend to use most frequently. (check = 0, circle = 1)

14. Written notes or comments	36	41
15. Flanders or other type of systematic analysis	8	2
16. Video-tape	10	3
17. Audio-tape	8	3
18. Conference	28	66
19. Check-list	36	19

Frequencies Expressed in %

CLASSROOM TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. Please circle yes/no if you feel the skill is one you should or should not have.

Please circle the number that best expresses the extent to which you feel prepared in the supervision of associate teachers in relation to the following supervisory tools and areas.

(1 = very skilled -- could help train others in
2 = comfortably skilled in
3 = some knowledge and skill in
4 = aware of but not skilled in
5 = not at all prepared in)

Yes (0) No (1)

60

20, 21. Writing behaviorally stated objectives

22, 23. Analysis of lesson and unit plans

24, 25. Analysis of teacher's classroom instructional behavior

No.	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.	78	6				
21.		14	40	29	8	3
22.	83	2				
23.		20	57	14	4	.5
24.	82	2				
25.		19	53	16	4	2

Frequencies Expressed in %

CLASSROOM TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No.		0	1	2	3	4	5
26, 27.	Use of Flanders or other type of verbal interaction analysis	35	29				
			2	7	18	22	31
28, 29.	Use of audio/video tape for feedback	60	18				
			4	20	25	29	11
30, 31.	Human relation skills	80	2				
			17	45	21	7	2
32, 33.	Micro-teaching for specific teaching skill development	56	14				
			6	18	21	23	15
34, 35.	Analysis of your own supervisory conference	73	6				
			8	35	33	11	3
36, 37.	Evaluation of teaching	81	1				
			15	52	22	4	2
38, 39.	Other	3	2				
			2	2	1		.5

Frequencies Expressed in %

IV. To what extent does/did your associate teacher(s) gain experience in the following:

No.	A great amount 1	2	Some 3	4	Not at all 5
40. Tutoring	14	15	46	11	11
41. Small group instruction	41	28	24	3	3
42. Total class instruction	58	26	11	3	1
43. Facilitate independent study	9	26	34	13	11
44. Large group instruction (50+)	8	9	16	11	50
45. Total unit planning	20	29	31	8	10
46. Parent - Teacher conferences	3	7	27	16	45
47. PTA meetings	3	5	20	13	57
48. Faculty meetings	11	15	46	8	18
49. Grading papers	50	31	15	1	2
50. Playground supervision	16	16	22	5	37
51. Test development	18	29	34	10	8

Frequencies expressed in %

No.		A great amount 1	2	Some 3	4	Not at all 5
52.	Classroom management	50	36	10	2	
53.	Community events related to school	2	6	28	21	40
54.	Report card grading	8	20	39	12	18
55.	Simulations -- instructional games	16	25	36	10	11

Frequencies Expressed in %

CLASSROOM TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

V. Please indicate the degree of your satisfaction with each of the following aspects of the TEC by circling the appropriate number:

(1 = Extremely satisfied
2 = satisfied
3 = no experience or awareness of item
4 = dissatisfied
5 = extremely dissatisfied)

56. The structure of the Steering Committee

57. The operation of the Steering Committee

58. Assignments of associate teachers to two or more classroom teachers

64

59. Information about each associate teacher prior to arrival

60. In-service program for cooperating teachers

61. The role by clinical professor(s)

62. Communication with the clinical professor(s)

63. Preparation of classroom teachers to supervise associate teachers

64. Ten-week period for student teaching

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	7	38	38	5	.5
57.	7	34	40	6	.5
58.	11	46	14	17	6
59.	13	49	7	22	6
60.	6	31	33	16	6
61.	24	50	6	12	3
62.	28	49	6	10	3
63.	6	44	16	24	4
64.	14	51	2	17	6

Frequencies Expressed in %

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No.		1	2	3	4	5
65.	The seminar for associate teachers	7	44	28	10	3
66.	Orientation for associate teachers at center	11	34	33	11	2
67.	The contribution of associate teachers to the instruction of your pupils	24	63	2	6	3
68.	Professional preparation of the associate teacher	25	57	3	9	2
69.	Subject matter preparation of the associate teacher	19	55	6	13	2
70.	Curriculum changes influenced by having a TEC in your school	7	31	47	4	2
71.	Your involvement in planning, etc. for the seminar	3	20	55	11	4
72.	Amount of stipend paid each quarter for your supervisory help	6	65	4	15	6
73.	Your professional growth	17	66	5	6	.5

Frequencies Expressed in %